

DAC

PATENT 013943 Customer No. 30,767

IN THE UNTED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT:	Lester V. Broersma)	
SERIAL NO:	10/772,814)	
FILED:	2/4/04)	
TITLE:	AUTO-ADAPTING TUBE FITTING)	
ART UNIT:	3679)	
EXAMINER:	David E. Bochna)	

PETITION TO REVIVE UNINTENTIONALLY ABANDONED APPLICATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to an action dated October 5, 2005 by the United State Patent and Trademark Office. Applicant hereby petitions to revive this unintentionally abandoned application. Applicant submits the following statements and evidence in support of its petition.

As can be seen in the supporting declaration by John D. Buchaca, the previous attorney of record for this application, the office action dated October 5, 2005 was not received by his office. The application file was transferred to our office on October 20, 2005 by Buchaca. In reviewing said file, we subsequently filed a Request for Change of

Correspondence Address and Revocation of Power of Attorney and Appointment of New

09/20/2006 MGEBREM1 00000008 10772814

01 FC:1453

1500.00 OP

M. Long

Representative with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 31, 2005 and we

received the Notice of Acceptance of Power of Attorney dated November 10, 2005. We

filed a Status Letter on February 13, 2006 and received the return postcard dated

February 16, 2006. We subsequently filed a Status Letter on August 11, 2006 and

received the return postcard dated August 14, 2006. On August 14, 2006, we received

the Notice of Abandonment dated August 10, 2006. Prior to that date, we were unaware

of the current status of this application and had no notice of an unanswered office action.

Applicant hereby petitions for revival of this application due to not having

received the aforementioned Office Action dated October 5, 2005. Enclosed herewith is

the requisite petition fee for a large entity. Applicant further submits the requisite reply

to the October 5, 2005 Office Action, the requisite terminal disclaimer as outlined in 37

C.F.R. 1.137(d)(1), the requisite terminal disclaimer fee, and a statement under 37 C.F.R.

3.73 by the assignee.

The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required

reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional.

Respectfully submitted,

KEISLING PIEPER & SCOTT PLC

Meredith/K/Lowry, Reg. No/58,422

1 East Center Street, Suite 2

Fayetteville, AR 72701

(479) 251-0800

Attorneys for Applicant

Date: 9.15.06

2